

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/054,532	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yvette C. Thornton	1752

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yvette C. Thornton. (3) _____

(2) Michael Hull. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 11 March 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 3-7, 16-21 and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nachbur et al. US 3449302 A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In an attempt to expedite prosecution, the attorney was asked to cancel claims 3-7 and 29 via examiner's amendment. The prior art reference of Nachbur renders the said claims obvious. The examiner agreed to the proposed amendment to the claims. Claim 16 will be amended to include the limitations of the independent claim.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required